

patrol (divided into three shifts), four shift sergeants, one sergeant of communication resources, one sergeant and four detectives for Yolo Officers Narcotics Enforcement Team, and one sergeant and two deputies for boat patrol (Yolo County 2002d, 2005).

The YCSD patrol officers are dispatched by Yolo Communications Emergency Services Agency (YCESA). YCESA is a countywide agency set up through a joint powers agreement; the agency-dispatches calls for fire protection, law enforcement, and animal services for numerous cities in Yolo County, such as Winters and West Sacramento, as well as unincorporated areas. YCSD has mutual aid agreements with other law enforcement jurisdictions to obtain assistance with calls made to YCSD regarding activities in designated locations. Patrol vehicles for YCSD are dispatched according to the areas they are patrolling and the location of the activity requiring law enforcement or assistance (Yolo County 2002d, 2005).

SCHOOL FACILITIES

Woodland Joint Unified School District provides educational services to the town of Yolo and the project area. Woodland Joint Unified School District includes 12 elementary schools (grades K–5), two middle schools (grades 6–8), two comprehensive senior high schools (grades 9–12), a continuation high school, and an adult school. Student population for the district exceeds 10,500 with an annual growth rate of approximately 2% (Woodland Joint Unified School District 2005). The town of Yolo has one school, Cache Creek Continuation High School, which had an enrollment of 161 students in the 2003–2004 school year (Woodland Joint Unified School District 2004).

DISCUSSION

- a) **Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services: fire protection, police protection, schools, parks or other public facilities.**

No Impact. The proposed project does not include proposals for new housing. Therefore, the proposed project would not generate students or increase demands for school services or facilities. The proposed project would not increase demands for fire protection, sheriff services, or other public facilities because the proposed project would not include new structures, such as housing or businesses, or indirectly increase housing or businesses in the project area. Construction of the setback levee and road relocation would not change the type or intensity of land uses in the area; therefore, the demand for fire and sheriff protection services would be the same for the proposed project as that currently provided on-site. Emergency response services would be unhampered during project construction and operation, including construction of the road relocation. Nonetheless, plans to ensure the continuation of emergency response services during construction would be incorporated into final project specifications. Because the proposed project would use existing public services and no additional services or changes to existing services would be required, the proposed project would have no impact on public services.

RECREATION

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XIV. Recreation. Would the project:					
a)	Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b)	Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

Yolo County owns and maintains 11 park/recreation facilities comprised of approximately 1,320 acres, with 25% of these parks considered to be fully developed (Yolo County 2001). The Cache Creek watershed extends from Yolo County into Lake and Colusa Counties. The creek is a major landscape feature across Yolo County, flowing through the Capay Valley, across the lands north of Esparto, south of the Dunnigan Hills, and then north of Woodland into its settling basin on the Yolo Bypass (Yolo County 2002a, 2002b).

Cache Creek Canyon Regional Park, the largest park in Yolo County, is approximately 35 miles west of the town of Yolo and adjacent to Highway 16. The park covers approximately 760 acres and consists of both developed and undeveloped areas. This park also provides access to nearly 50,000 acres of U.S. Bureau of Land Management wilderness property. Cache Creek Canyon Regional Park offers picnicking, nature study, swimming, fishing, hiking and horseback trails, inner-tubing, and camping. Private outfitters offer whitewater rafting. Facilities at the middle site include three group and 45 individual campsites along with picnic and parking areas (Yolo County 2002b).

Yolo County operates one developed community park, Esparto Community Park, located off Highway 16 (Yolo County 2005). Other parks in Yolo County are designated for open space or boat launching and bank fishing on the Sacramento River and include:

- ▶ Clarksburg Boat Launch Facility (3.95 acres),
- ▶ Elkhorn Regional Park (48 acres),
- ▶ Helvetia Oak Grove (11 acres),
- ▶ Yolo County Grasslands Regional Park (320 acres),
- ▶ Airport Park (1.6 acres),
- ▶ Camp Haswell Park (5 acres),
- ▶ Knights Landing Boat Launch (5 acres),
- ▶ Vernon A. Nichols Park (25 acres),
- ▶ Cache Creek Canyon Regional Park (752 acres), and
- ▶ Putah Creek Fishing Access Areas (83 acres).

The project site is located on the north bank of Cache Creek at LM 3.9L and LM 4.2L. There are currently no existing recreation opportunities at the project site or vicinity. The closest recreational area to the project site is

the Esparto Community Park, which is located approximately 13 miles west of the project area along Highway 16 in Esparto. The park includes picnic tables, barbecues, turf area, and a playground (Yolo County 2001).

DISCUSSION

- a) **Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?**

No Impact. There are currently no existing recreation opportunities at the project site or in the vicinity of the proposed project. Public access to Cache Creek is restricted as a result of private lands that border the creek at the project site. The existing levees are currently not used for recreational purposes, and are used exclusively for levee monitoring and maintenance. Therefore, no impact would occur.

- b) **Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?**

No Impact. The proposed project does not include proposals for new housing, recreational facilities, or recreational resources. Because there would not be any additional residents generated by the proposed project or increased access to existing recreational facilities, the proposed project would not increase demands on parks or other recreational facilities, and would not result in accelerated physical deterioration of existing recreational facilities. The proposed project would relocate a small portion of County Road 17a and construct setback levees on private land. The new setback levees would not be used for recreational purposes. The setback levees and road relocation would not negatively affect any existing recreational opportunities or facilities. The proposed project would have no effect on recreation.

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE		Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV.	Transportation/Traffic. Would the project:				
a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b)	Exceed, individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

STATE HIGHWAYS

SR 16 and I-5 are the primary highways in the project vicinity. Both SR 16 and I-5 provide north-south circulation within the project vicinity. I-5 lies southwest of the project site, and SR 16 is located south of the project site. With the exception of I-5, a four-lane highway, all other roads in the project vicinity are two lanes.

COUNTY ROADWAYS

County roads in the project vicinity include County Roads (CRs) 97B, 98, 98A, 98E, 99a, and 99W (north-south circulation) and CR 16A, 17a, and 18 (east-west circulation).

TRAFFIC TYPES AND VOLUMES

All roadways within the project vicinity are traveled by automobiles, trucks, motorcycles, emergency vehicles, and with the exception of I-5, agricultural equipment (USACE 2002). Traffic counts for I-5 in the project vicinity are presented below in Table 3-7.

Table 3-7 I-5 Traffic Counts							
I-5 Annual AADT ¹		South			North		
Post Mile	Description	Peak Hr	Peak Mo	AADT	Peak Hr	Peak Mo	AADT
10.81	Jct. State Route 16, County Road 18	3,050	37,000	30,500	2,950	33,500	28,500
12.34	Yolo Interchange, County Road 17	2,950	33,500	28,500	2,750	30,000	25,000
¹ Year 2007 AADT volumes. Source: DOT 2007.							

Traffic counts for county roads within the project vicinity are presented in Table 3-8. Level of Service (LOS) traffic counts were not available for the project area roadways presented in Table 3-8.

Table 3-8 County Road Traffic Counts	
Roadway Description	Average Daily Traffic (ADT)
CR 97B	—
CR 98 between CR 14 and CR 15	204
CR 98A between CR 16A and CR 17	31
CR 98E	—
CR 99A	—
CR 99W (Cacheville Rd) between CR 17 and 2 nd St	1073
CR 16A between SH 113 and CR 98	361
CR 17A	280
CR 17 between CR 96B and CR 98A	—
CR 18 between CR 99W and CR 99E	550
CR = County Road Source: Suellen Coast at Yolo County, pers. comm. October 2, 2008.	

AIRPORTS

Two general aviation airports and a number of private airports are located in Yolo County. Yolo County Airport is about 11 miles west of Woodland, and the Watts-Woodland Airport is located approximately 6 miles southwest of the project site. Commercial flight services are provided by Sacramento International Airport about 20 miles east of Woodland (USACE 2002). Sunrise Dusters, the closest private airport, is located approximately 7 miles north of the project.

TRANSIT

The Yolo County Transportation District operates Yolobus, the public transportation for Yolo County. Yolobus serves Woodland, Davis, West Sacramento, Madison, Esparto, Capay, Dunnigan, Yolo, Southport, Knights Landing, and Winters. There are no bus routes that serve the project site.

BIKEWAYS

Bicycle facilities include Class I (off-street facilities), Class II (on-street bicycle lanes identified with signage and markings), and Class III (on-street bicycle routes identified by signage). There are no bikeways within the immediate project vicinity or within the project site (USACE 2002).

RAILROADS

The California Northern Railroad (CNRR) is the only railroad within the project vicinity. It travels alongside I-5 between Cache Creek and the City of Woodland/Yolo County line. CNRR is a branch of a larger line and locally it serves the community's industries. The train does not carry passengers; it is solely a freight train serving local demand. The train schedules depend on necessity and do not run on a consistent basis (USACE 2002).

DISCUSSION

- a) **Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. Borrow material for the setback levee would be hauled from an off-site location. During construction, there would be approximately 52 11-mile haul trips to the project site for transport of fill material during the maximum construction activity periods. There would also be approximately 43 additional vehicle trips per day for construction employee commute trips. The increased traffic due to construction of the project would be temporary and would be spread out over a 2-month period. Operation of the project would not require any additional vehicle trips. Maintenance and monitoring of the setback levee would be consistent with the existing maintenance and monitoring schedule for levees on the project site. The proposed project would not result in any new or different land uses or population increases. Because the increased traffic due to construction would be temporary and there would be no increased traffic due to operation of the setback levee, this impact would be less than significant.

- b) **Exceed, individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. As above in a), the increased traffic due to construction would be temporary and any associated degradation in LOS would be temporary. There would be no increased traffic due to operation of the setback levee. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

- c) **Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

No Impact. The proposed project would not change air traffic patterns or increase traffic levels. Therefore, there are no impacts to air traffic patterns.

- d) **Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed setback levee would be designed to USACE standards including the proper slopes and ingress and egress. The proposed road relocation would be designed and constructed according to County safety standards. Because project features would be designed to the appropriate standards and would not cause an increase in hazards due to design features, this impact would be less than significant.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Emergency access to the project site would be maintained at all times, including during construction of the road relocation. Therefore, the project site would not reduce response times for emergency services, such as fire protection, police, and ambulance. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?

No Impact. Parking for construction and crew vehicles would be provided within the proposed construction staging area. Therefore, no impact to parking capacity in the project area would occur.

g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?

No Impact. Implementation of the project, including road relocation, would not interfere with Yolobus routes, the CNNR, or any bikeways in the project vicinity. Therefore, there is no impact to alternative transportation.

PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVI. Utilities and Service Systems.				
Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

This section provides an overview of utilities and service systems in the project vicinity, including water supply, wastewater service, solid waste management, and storm water drainage. Impacts are evaluated in relation to increased demand for utilities and service systems associated with the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

The project site is located in Yolo County on the north bank of Cache Creek, just east of the town of Yolo. Within the project site, there are no major utility corridors. However, an existing Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) power line and six power poles are located in and immediately adjacent to the project site at LM 3.9L. The majority of the residents in the unincorporated area have septic systems and wells that eliminate the need for water and sewer mains originating from the town of Yolo or the City of Woodland. An existing leach field is located within the project boundaries at LM 4.2L. Utilities such as electrical transmission lines, gas pipelines, and communications lines run primarily along the major roads through the project area (Highway 113, Highway 16, County Road 17, and County Road 99) before branching out to serve more remote customers. Closer to the town of Yolo and the Woodland city limits, there are gas, water, and sewer pipes, as well as electric and communications that serve local businesses and residents (USACE and State Reclamation Board of California 2003).

DISCUSSION

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No Impact. The proposed project would not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, or other uses that could generate any new source of wastewater. Therefore, no impact would occur related to exceeding any applicable wastewater treatment requirements.

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less-than-Significant Impact. Construction of the setback levee and road realignment would not create any new demands for water or wastewater treatment. A portion of an existing leach field is located along the outer project boundary at LM 4.2L. It is not anticipated that the leach field would be encountered during construction at this outer edge (Royer pers. comm. 2008). However, DWR will perform a subsurface exploration to determine if the leach field is within the footprint of the setback levee. If the leach field is encountered, it will require relocation (Royer pers. comm. 2008). The effects on wastewater treatment from relocation of the leach field would be temporary and would not be considered significant. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less-than-Significant Impact. The proposed project would include construction of impermeable surfaces for construction of the road relocation. However, the road relocation would not generate additional storm water runoff, requiring the need for new storm water drainage facilities. Construction of the proposed setback levee would maintain current flood protection levels and would benefit the community as a whole by reducing the level of flood risk. Therefore, no impact would occur related to the construction of new storm water facilities. This impact would be less than significant.

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No Impact. Construction or operation of the project would not create any new demands for water supply. Therefore, no impact would occur related to water supply or expanded entitlements.

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

No Impact. The proposed project would not involve the construction of new homes, businesses, or other uses that could generate any new source of wastewater. Therefore, no impact would occur related to the provision of wastewater treatment.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

No Impact. The proposed project would not generate any additional solid waste or create a demand for solid waste disposal capacity. Therefore, no impact would occur related to solid waste systems.

g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact. The proposed project would not generate any additional solid waste, create a demand for solid waste disposal capacity, or cause any conflict with laws or statutes that relate to solid waste. Therefore, no impact would occur related to compliance with solid waste statutes and regulations.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

THRESHOLDS OF SIGNIFICANCE	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XVII. Mandatory Findings of Significance.				
a) Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Authority: Public Resources Code Sections 21083 and 21087.

Reference: Public Resources Code Sections 21080(c), 21080.1, 21080.3, 21082.1, 21083, 21083.3, 21093, 21094, 21151; *Sundstrom v. County of Mendocino*, 202 Cal.App.3d 296 (1988); *Leonoff v. Monterey Board of Supervisors*, 222 Cal.App.3d 1337 (1990).

DISCUSSION

- a) **Does the project have the potential to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

Less than Significant With Mitigation. Development of the project would not substantially degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species; cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels; threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community; reduce or restrict the range of rare or endangered plants or animals; or, eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory. As discussed in the analyses provided in this Initial Study, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce all potentially significant impacts to biological and cultural resources, as well as to other issue areas, to less-than-significant levels.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)**

Less than Significant With Mitigation. No past, current, or probable future projects were identified in the project vicinity that, when added with project-related impacts, would result in cumulatively considerable impacts. No cumulatively considerable impacts would occur with development of the project. As discussed in the analyses provided in this Initial Study, mitigation measures are proposed to reduce all potentially significant impacts to less-than-significant levels. The incremental effects of the proposed project are not cumulatively considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past, current, and probable future projects.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

Less-than-Significant Impact. No project-related environmental effects were identified that would cause substantial adverse effects, after mitigation was proposed, on human beings. As discussed herein, the project has the potential to create temporary significant impacts related to air quality, noise, and hazardous materials during construction. However, with implementation of required mitigation measures, these impacts would be reduced to less-than-significant levels.